APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,807	11/26/2003	Juha Lehikoinen	037145-0201	8190

			EXAMINER
27433	7590	07/14/2006	FABER, DAVID

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
321 NORTH CLARK STREET
SUITE 2800
CHICAGO, IL 60610-4764

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	10/722,807	LEHIKOINEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	David Faber	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **3** MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 May 2006*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to the amendment filed 22 May 2006.

2.   Claims 12, and 32 have been amended.

3.   The objection of Claim 1 has been withdrawn necessitated by the amendment.

The rejection of Claims 32-36 under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been withdrawn necessitated by

the amendment.

4.   Claims 1-36 are pending. Claims 1, 13, 27, and 32 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6.   Claims 1, 2, 7, 10, 13, 14, 20, 22, 27, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

as being anticipated by Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002)

As per independent Claim 1, Himmel et al discloses a method comprising:

- Storing search criteria associated with a bookmarked Internet resource in a

   bookmark entry (e.g. Column 4, lines 53-56; Column 6, lines 53 – Column 7,

   line 3: Once search results have been acquired, the search results the user

   selects are made into bookmarks wherein the selected search results are

   incorporated into a bookmark page, where each bookmark is associated with

   descriptive text, keywords or abstract is presented.)

- Storing a resource attribute associated with the bookmarked Internet resource in the bookmark entry. (e.g. Column 4, line 53-54; Column 6, lines 13-15, 61-62: URL is saved to the bookmark entry)

As per dependent Claim 2, Himmel et al discloses a method further comprising:

- Storing a locator identifier associated with the bookmarked Internet resource in the bookmark entry. (e.g. Column 4, line 53-54; Column 6, lines 13-15, 61-62: URL is saved to the bookmark entry)

As per dependent Claim 7, Himmel et al discloses a method:

- Wherein the resource attribute further comprises a meta data of the Internet resource. (Column 4, lines 58-60: Discloses the default title tag used in HTML headers is used when descriptive text is unavailable.)

As per dependent Claim 10, Himmel et al discloses a method:

- locator identifier is a uniform resource locator. (URL). (e.g. Column 4, line 53-54; Column 6, lines 13-15, 61-62: URL is saved to the bookmark entry)

As per dependent Claim 13, Himmel et al discloses a device:

- computer including an Internet browser (FIG 1; Column 1, line 18)
- means for connecting the Internet browser to a search engine: (Column 5, lines 53-65)

- means for adding a bookmark entry, the bookmark entry having a resource attribute (e.g. Column 4, line 53-54; Column 6, lines 13-15, 61-62: URL is saved to the bookmark entry) and a resource search criteria associated with a bookmarked Internet resource. (e.g. Column 4, lines 53-56; Column 6, lines 53 – Column 7, line 3: Once search results have been acquired, the search results the user selects are made into bookmarks wherein the selected search results are incorporated into a bookmark page, where each bookmark is associated with descriptive text, keywords or abstract is presented.)

As per dependent Claim 14, Claim 14 recites similar limitations as in Claim 2 and is similar rejected under Himmel et al.

As per dependent Claim 20, Claim 20 recites similar limitations as in Claim 8 and is similar rejected under Himmel et al.

As per dependent Claim 22, Himmel et al discloses a device further comprises:

- personal computer (Column 3, lines 5-17: IBM PC series, a personal computer)

As per independent Claim 27, Claim 27 recites similar limitations as in Claim 13 and is similar rejection under rationale. Himmel et al discloses a system comprising:

- a first computer having a search engine (Column 5, lines 53-60: Discloses the use of a search engine on a server)

As per dependent Claim 31, Himmel et al discloses bookmark entry further

comprising:

- a resource address (e.g. Column 4, line 53-54; Column 6, lines 13-15, 61-62:

  URL is saved to the bookmark entry. URL is an address.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3, 15 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002)

As per dependent Claim 3, Himmel et al discloses fails to specifically discloses

the search criteria further comprise a selected text passage from the bookmarked

Internet resource. However, Column 6, line 65 – Column 7, line 2, Himmel et al

discloses descriptive text or information returned from the server such as an abstract or

key words that can be included with the bookmark entry. In addition, user can enter text

as the descriptive text therefore selecting text to be adding into the bookmark. (Column

4, lines 53-57)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel et al's method with the ability to

determine which text is used in the bookmark entity since the ability would have

provided the ability of flexibility and customability of creating a bookmark entry.

As per dependent Claim 15, Claim 15 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3 and

is similar rejected under Himmel et al.

As per dependent Claim 28, Claim 28 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3 and

is similar rejected under Himmel et al.

9.   Claims 4-6, 11, 16, 18-19, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002) in

further in view of Bharat (US Patent #6,810,395, filed 11/22/1999).

As per dependent Claims 4, 5, 6, and 11, Himmel et al fails to specifically

disclose the search criteria comprises search terms from a search history file containing

terms used in an Internet search engine, the resource attribute further comprising a

resource name, and a creation or modification date, and the dynamic bookmark is a

hypermedia link on a Internet resource. However, Bharat discloses the use of submitting

a query to a search engine wherein search results return based on the query. (FIG 6)

Each search result contains a title of the page, and a hyperlink containing the URL and

the query terms used within the search. (FIG 8(a); Column 7, line 64 – Column 8, line

12) The user is able to save the 'lead' or bookmark that can include the query, title,

URL, and the time at the event occurred (lead being saved, or one may say creation

date) (Column 10, lines 55-61)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel et al's method with Bharat's method

since Bharat's method would have provided of benefit of allowing a user to specify and

use query-specific bookmarks.

As per dependent Claim 16, Claim 16 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4 and

is similar rejected under Himmel et al and Bharat.

As per dependent Claim 18, Claim 18 recites similar limitations as in Claim 5 and

is similar rejected under Himmel et al and Bharat.

As per dependent Claim 19, Claim 19 recites similar limitations as in Claim 6 and

is similar rejected under Himmel et al and Bharat.

As per dependent Claim 29, Claim 29 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4 and

is similar rejected under Himmel et al and Bharat.

As per dependent Claim 30, Claim 30 recites similar limitations as in Claim 11

and is similar rejected under Himmel et al and Bharat.

10.   Claims 8, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002) in further in view of

Nielsen (US Patent 5,963,964, patented 10/5/1999) in further view of Hawkins(Hawkins,

"EXIF.org," dated 10/5/2003)

As per dependent Claim 8, Himmel et al fails to specifically disclose the resource

attribute further comprising EXIF data of the Internet resource. However, Nielsen

discloses the ability to create a Visual Bookmark Image by taking a snapshot of the viewed web page. (Abstract; FIG 14)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Himmel et al's method with Nielsen's method since Nielsen's method would have provided the benefit that would have allowed the user to view a bookmarked web page by selecting a visual bookmark of desired page from a plurality of visual bookmarks instead of making a selection from a list of web page titles.

However, Himmel et al and Nielsen fail to specifically disclose the image contains EXIF data. It was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that most images stored in a image compressed format such as a JPEG format. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have used JPEG to provide the benefit of reduced file size for quicker access and transmission over a network of a JPEG image.

In addition, Hawkins discloses the EXIF format is for storing interchange information in image files especially using JPEG compression. (pp 1) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel et al's and Nielsen's methods with EXIF.org's disclosure of EXIF since it would have provided the benefit of being used with JPEG compression that would allowed for smaller file size of the image.

As per dependent Claim 21, Claim 21 recites similar limitations as in Claim 8 and is similar rejected under Himmel et al, Nielsen, and Hawkins.

11.   Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel et

al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002) in further in view of Castro (Castro,

"HTML for the World Wide Web with XHTML and CSS: Visual QuickStart Guide, 5th

Edition", copyright 2003, pp 33-35)

Examiner provides the printout "HTML for the World Wide Web with XHTML and

CSS: Visual QuickStart Guide, 5th Edition" from PeachPit Online Bookstore as evidence

disclosing the book's publishing date is Sept. 17, 2002.

As per dependent Claim 9, Himmel et al fails to specifically disclose the resource

attribute further comprises a file name associated with the Internet Resource. However,

Castro discloses a (absolute) URL comprises a file name of the file itself. (pp 33-34)

It would have obvious been to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel et al's method with Castro's method

since Castro's method would provided the benefit of knowing the exact location of a file

within a URL.

12.   Claims 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002) (hereinafter known as

Himmel '316) in further view of Himmel (US Patent #6,810,395, filed 11/22/1999)

(hereinafter known as Himmel '360) in further view of Duri et al (US PGPub

2002/0156832, published 10/24/2002).

As per dependent Claim 12, Himmel '316 fails to specifically updating a

bookmark associated with the bookmark Internet resource when the bookmarked

Internet resource has changed being performing by the operations of: performing a

search using the stored critera to obtain search results; comparing a resource attribute

of resources from the search results from the performed search with the store resource

attribute of the bookmarked Internet resource to obtain a matching resource having a

similar resource attribute, and storing a new locator identifier of the matching resource

as a property of the dynamic Internet bookmark entry. However, Himmel '360 discloses

comparing a title's and URL's of a bookmark entity and the visited site, and if a match

between one of the two occurs, the referencing URL or the title is updated based on

which attribute has changed. (Column 17, lines 40-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel '316's method with Himmel '360's

method since Himmel '360's method would have provided of benefit of dynamically

updating a designated bookmark in a browser.

However, Himmel '316 and '360 fail specifically to disclose performing a search

using the stored critera to obtain search results. However, Duri et al discloses reading

dynamic bookmark query attributes, stored in a bookmark shown in FIG 7, received in a

request where a search is made based on the query attributes from the bookmarks. A

search is conducted and the results are sent back to client. (Paragraph 0058)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel '316's and Himmel '360's method with

Duri et al's method since Duri et al's method would have provided of benefit of a more

effective method on managing bookmarks by dynamically updating using attributes.

As per dependent Claim 17, Claim 17 recites similar limitations as in Claim 12 and is similar rejected under Himmel '316, Himmel '360 and Duri et al.

13.   Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002) (hereinafter known as Himmel '316) in further view of Duri et al (US PGPub 2002/0156832, published 10/24/2002).

As per dependent Claims 23-26, Himmel et al fails to specifically disclose the computer comprises a mobile device and that the mobile device comprises a personal digital assistant, a mobile terminal, and a wireless access protocol enabled mobile phone. However, Duri et al discloses the client being of portable device taking the form of a personal digital assistant with wireless communications, or the client being a cellular phone that contains wireless communications. (Paragraph 0022) These mobile devices are clients to a server therefore act as a mobile terminal. (Paragraph 0023)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel et al's method with Duri et al's method since using a portable device such as a PDA would have provided the benefit being able to use dynamic bookmarks on a computer that isn't stationary.

14.   Claims 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002) (hereinafter known as Himmel '316) in further view of Himmel (US Patent #6,810,395, filed 11/22/1999) (hereinafter known as Himmel '360).

As per independent Claim 32, Himmel '316 discloses a computer program product with computer code comprising:

- Create a dynamic (Column 5, line 41, bookmark behavior can be set as dynamic) Internet bookmark for a bookmark Internet resource (FIG 3-4, Column 5, line 53 – Column 6, line 60)

However, Himmel ' 316 fails to specifically disclose update the dynamic Internet bookmark when the bookmark Internet resource has changed. However, Himmel '360 discloses a process when a dynamic bookmark is update by comparing a title's and URL's of a bookmark entity and the visited site, and if a match between one of the two occurs, the referencing URL or the title is updated based on which attribute has changed. (Column 17, lines 40-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel '316's method with Himmel '360's method since Himmel '360's method would have provided of benefit of dynamically updating a designated bookmark in a browser.

As per dependent Claim 33, Himmel '316 discloses a computer program product:

- Computer code to perform a search using a search criteria to obtain search results; (Column 5, line 53 – Column 6, line 10: Discloses searching using search text to obtain search results)

However, Himmel '316 fails to specifically disclose computer code comparing a resource attribute of resources from the search results from the performed search with the store resource attribute of the bookmarked Internet resource to obtain a matching

resource having a similar resource attribute, and computer code to store a new locator identifier of the matching resource in the bookmark entry. However, Himmel '360 discloses comparing a title's and URL's of a bookmark entity and the visited site, and if a match between one of the two occurs, the referencing URL or the title is updated based on which attribute has changed. (Column 17, lines 40-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel '316's method with Himmel '360's method since Himmel '360's method would have provided of benefit of dynamically updating a designated bookmark in a browser.

15.   Claims 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002) (hereinafter known as Himmel '316) in further view of Himmel (US Patent #6,810,395, filed 11/22/1999) (hereinafter known as Himmel '360) in further in view of Bharat (US Patent #6,810,395, filed 11/22/1999).

As per dependent Claim 34, Himmel '316 discloses a computer program product:

- Computer code to store a resource attribute associated with the bookmarked Internet resource in the bookmark entry. (e.g. Column 4, line 53-54; Column 6, lines 13-15, 61-62: URL is saved to the bookmark entry)

- Computer code to store a locator identifier associated with the bookmarked Internet resource in the bookmark entry. (e.g. Column 4, line 53-54; Column 6, lines 13-15, 61-62: URL is saved to the bookmark entry)

However, Himmel '316 and Himmel '360 fail to specifically disclose computer code to store a search critera associated with the bookmarked Internet resource in the bookmark entry. However, Bharat discloses the use of submitting a query to a search engine wherein search results return based on the query. (FIG 6) Each search result contains the query terms used within the search. (FIG 8(a); Column 7, line 64 – Column 8, line 12) The user is able to save the 'lead' or bookmark that can include the query terms. (Column 10, lines 55-61)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel '316 and Himmel '360's method with Bharat's method since Bharat's method would have provided of benefit of allowing a user to specify and use query-specific bookmarks.

As per dependent Claim 35, Himmel et al discloses fails to specifically discloses the search criteria associated with a bookmarked Internet resource comprises a selected text passage from the bookmarked Internet resource. However, Column 6, line 65 – Column 7, line 2, Himmel et al discloses descriptive text or information returned from the server such as an abstract or key words that can be included with the bookmark entry. In addition, user can enter text as the descriptive text therefore selecting text to be adding into the bookmark. (Column 4, lines 53-57)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel et al's method with the ability to determine which text is used in the bookmark entity since the ability would have provided the ability of flexibility and customability of creating a bookmark entry.

As per dependent Claim 36, Himmel et al fails to specifically disclose the search criteria comprises search terms from a search history file containing terms used in an Internet search engine. However, Bharat discloses the use of submitting a query to a search engine wherein search results return based on the query. (FIG 6) Each search result contains the query terms used within the search. (FIG 8(a); Column 7, line 64 – Column 8, line 12) The user is able to save the 'lead' or bookmark that can include the query terms. (Column 10, lines 55-61)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel '316 and Himmel '360's method with Bharat's method since Bharat's method would have provided of benefit of allowing a user to specify and use query-specific bookmarks.

Response to Arguments

16.   Applicant's arguments filed 22 May 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

17.   In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., search criteria of Claim 1 referring to actual query terms) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

18.   In regards to the Applicant arguing Himmel et al does not teach storing search

criteria and storing a resource attribute, where the search criteria and resource attribute

are associated with a bookmarked Internet resource in a bookmark entry; however,

Examiner disagrees. The claim language of Claim 1 clearly states "search criteria" and

does not state the search criteria refers to actual query terms in Claim 1 as Applicant

argues. Thus, Himmel' 316 et al teaches search results with a URL, title, keywords, are

saved as a bookmark by the user. In addition, the URL is the resource attribute saved

in the bookmark.

In regards to the Applicant arguing Bharat does not solve the limitations Himmel

'316 et al fails to cure, the Examiner disagrees. Bharat discloses features of search

criteria being returned based on a search query. The search criteria returned includes a

search results page or history file that includes the title of the page (resource name), a

hyperlink including the URL, and the actual search terms used. Then, the user is able to

save the lead or bookmark which include the query terms, the resource names, the

hyperlink, and the time the event occur (or creation date). Thus, It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have

modified Himmel et al's method with Bharat's method of saving search query terms as a

bookmark since Bharat's method would have provided of benefit of allowing a user to

specify and use query-specific bookmarks. Adding Bharat features into Himmel et al's

ability to save bookmarks cure the deficiencies of Himmel et al.

In regards to the Applicant arguing Himmel '360 and Duri et al does not teach the

limitations of Claims 12 and 17 which do not cure the deficiencies of Himmel '316;

however, Examiner disagrees. Himmel '360 discloses a feature of comparing a title's

and URL's of a bookmark entity and the visited site, and if a match between one of the

two occurs, the referencing URL or the title is updated based on which attribute has

changed. (Column 17, lines 40-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel '316's method with Himmel '360's

method since Himmel '360's method would have provided of benefit of dynamically

updating a designated bookmark in a browser.

However, Himmel '316 and '360 fail specifically to disclose performing a search

using the stored criteria to obtain search results. However, Duri et al discloses reading

dynamic bookmark query attributes, stored in a bookmark shown in FIG 7, received in a

request where a search is made based on the query attributes from the bookmarks. A

search is conducted and the results are sent back to client. (Paragraph 0058)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel '316's and Himmel '360's method with

Duri et al's method since Duri et al's method would have provided of benefit of a more

effective method on managing bookmarks by dynamically updating using attributes.

Thus with Himmel '316 modified to include Himmel '360 and Duri et al, Duri et al

discloses performing a search using the stored criteria, such as Himmel '316's criteria or

search criteria stored in Duri et al. Using Himmel '360, Himmel '360 can use the feature

of updating dynamic bookmarks by comparing resource attributes using the search

results from Duri with the stored bookmark entry by Himmel '360, and store the update

to the corresponding bookmark with a new local identifier if there is a difference

between resource attributes. Thus, in further view of Himmel '360 and Duri et al to

Himmel '316, discloses updating a dynamic Internet bookmark entry.

Conclusion

19.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to David Faber whose telephone number is 571-272-2751.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8am to 430pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Faber
Patient Examiner
AU 2178

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER